Holographic fluids with perturbations of pressure and energy density at finite cutoff surface

Ya-Peng Hu,[1,2,3,*] Yu Tian,[4,3,†] Xiao-Ning Wu,[5,3,6,‡] and Hongsheng Zhang[7,3,§]

[1] *College of Science, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing 211106, China*
[2] *INPAC, Department of Physics, and Shanghai Key Lab for Particle Physics and Cosmology, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China*
[3] *State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*
[4] *School of Physics, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*
[5] *Institute of Mathematics, Academy of Mathematics and System Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*
[6] *Hua Loo-Keng Key Laboratory of Mathematics, CAS, Beijing 100190, China*
[7] *Center for Astrophysics, Shanghai Normal University, 100 Guilin Road, Shanghai 200234, China*

arXiv:1408.2173v4 [hep-th] 30 Jul 2015

We investigate the holographic fluids with perturbations of pressure and energy density at finite cutoff surface in the scenario of gravity/fluid correspondence. Perturbing the Schwarzschild-AdS black brane solution in the Einstein gravity, we explore the stress tensor of the holographic fluids with transport coefficients at a finite cutoff surface. We set a non-zero boundary condition for the derivative of $h(r)$ with respect to the radius direction r. We find that this boundary condition is critical to break the apparent degeneration of bulk viscosity and perturbation of the pressure for the dual fluid at the finite cutoff surface in our previous work (Phys.Lett. B732 (2014) 298). After this apparent degeneration broken, the bulk viscosity disappears, which is confirmed by the consideration of sound velocity.

PACS number: 11.25.Tq, 04.65.+e, 04.70.Dy

I. INTRODUCTION

The AdS/CFT correspondence [1–4] provides a remarkable connection between gravitational theory and quantum field theory. According to this correspondence, the gravitational theory in an asymptotically AdS spacetime can be formulated in terms of a quantum field theory on its boundary. In particular, the dynamics of a classical gravitational theory in the bulk is mapped to a strongly coupled quantum field theory on the boundary. Therefore, AdS/CFT provides some insights and a useful tool to investigate the strongly coupled field theory from the dual classical gravitational theory [5–10].

It is well-known that any interacting quantum field theory in the long wave-length limit can be effectively described by hydrodynamics, i.e. when the length scales under consideration are much larger than the correlation length of the theory. Under this situation the corpuscular property of the matters is smoothed, such as in QGP (quark-gluon plasma), and thus effectively becomes a fluid. From this viewpoint, one is led to the so-called gravity/fluid correspondence [11], which is considered as the long wave-length limit (hydrodynamical regime) of the AdS/CFT correspondence. In the AdS/CFT correspondence or gravity/fluid correspondence, the dual field theory usually resides on the infinite boundary (conformal boundary), and has conformal dynamics [11–21]. In fact, the AdS/CFT correspondence can be generalized to study non-conformal dual systems. A simple way of achieving this is to break the conformal symmetry by introducing a finite cutoff on the radial coordinate in the bulk, and it has been shown that a Navier-Stokes (NS) fluid lives on the cutoff surface $r = r_c$, which implies a deep relation between the NS equations and the gravitational equations [22–28, 36]. Moreover, from the renormalization group (RG) viewpoint, the radial direction of the bulk spacetime corresponds to the energy scale of the dual field theory [29–37]. The infinite boundary corresponds to the UV fixed point of the dual field theory, and hence cannot be reached by experiments. Therefore, the physics at a finite cutoff surface $r = r_c$, which means a finite energy scale becomes important, and the dependence of transport coefficients of holographic fluid on the cutoff surface r_c can be interpreted as the RG flow. In the scenario of the gravity/fluid correspondence, there are many investigations on the holographic fluid at a finite

*Electronic address: huyp@nuaa.edu.cn
†Electronic address: ytian@ucas.ac.cn
‡Electronic address: wuxn@amss.ac.cn
§Electronic address: hongsheng@shnu.edu.cn

cutoff surface [24, 26, 36, 38–43]. It is found that the holographic fluid on the hypersurface is usually non-conformal, which is expected and consistent with the fact that the conformal symmetry has been broken with a finite radial coordinate in the bulk [38–43].

In this paper, we apply the gravity/fluid correspondence to a finite cutoff surface, and focus on investigating the stress-energy tensor of holographic fluid with transport coefficients. For simplicity, we just take the Schwarzschild-AdS black brane in the Einstein gravity into account. After constructing the first order perturbative solution of this background bulk spacetime, we carefully analyze the boundary conditions to fix the undetermined parameters which are usually contained in the first order of stress tensor during investigating the holographic fluid at the finite cutoff surface. Compared with our previous work in zero charge case [43], i.e., where a special boundary condition $h(r_c)=0$ and $h'(r_c)=0$ has been chosen, a more general boundary condition is chosen in this paper where $h(r_c)=0$ and $h'(r_c)$ is kept as an arbitrary constant. We find that the pressure and energy density of the holographic fluid can be both perturbed in this general case, and also obtain the generally explicit forms of perturbations of pressure and energy density in the holographic fluid. Moreover, we find that the bulk viscosity term discovered in our previous work [43] disappears, since the bulk viscosity is more proper to merge into the perturbation of pressure in this general case. The legality of this merge is protected by considerations of the sound velocity in the fluid.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we mainly construct the first order perturbative solution of the Schwarzschild-AdS black brane solution, which is used the gravity/correpsondence method. In Sec. III, the boundary conditions are carefully analyzed to obtain the five undetermined parameters which are contained in the stress tensor of holographic fluid at the finite cutoff surface, and we obtain the generally explicit forms of perturbations of pressure and energy density in the holographic fluid. Moreover, we show that the degeneration of bulk viscosity and perturbation of pressure is broken, and thus the bulk viscosity appeared in our previous work [43] vanishes naturally. Sec. VII is devoted to the conclusion and discussion.

II. THE FIRST ORDER PERTURBATIVE SOLUTION OF THE SCHWARZSCHILD-ADS BLACK BRANE SOLUTION

The action of the five-dimensional Einstein gravity with a negative cosmological constant $\Lambda=-6/\ell^2$ is

$$I=\frac{1}{16\pi G}\int_{\mathcal{M}} d^5x\sqrt{-g^{(5)}}\left(R-2\Lambda\right), \tag{2.1}$$

For later convenience, we set the AdS radius $\ell=1$ and $16\pi G=1$, and the corresponding equation of motion is

$$R_{AB}-\frac{1}{2}Rg_{AB}+\Lambda g_{AB} \;=\; 0\;. \tag{2.2}$$

Obviously, the Schwarzschild-AdS black brane solution can be obtained from the above equation

$$ds^2=\frac{dr^2}{r^2f(r)}+r^2\left(\sum_{i=1}^{3}dx_i^2\right)-r^2f(r)dt^2, \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$f(r) \;=\; 1-\frac{2M}{r^4}. \tag{2.4}$$

From (2.3), the horizon is located at $r=r_+$, where r_+ is the positive root of $f(r)=0$, and the Hawking temperature of the Schwarzschild-AdS black brane solution is

$$T_+ \;=\; \frac{(r^2f(r))'}{4\pi}|_{r=r_+}=\frac{r_+}{\pi}\;. \tag{2.5}$$

In order to avoid the coordinate singularity, one can write the above black brane solution in the Eddington-Finkelstin coordinate system

$$ds^2 \;=\; -r^2f(r)dv^2+2dvdr+r^2(dx^2+dy^2+dz^2), \tag{2.6}$$

where $v=t+r_*$, and r_* is the tortoise coordinate satisfying $dr_*=dr/(r^2f)$.

Since the holographic fluid is investigated to reside at some cutoff hypersurface $r=r_c$ (r_c is a constant), thus it is useful to make the following coordinates transformation $v\to v/\sqrt{r_c^2f(r_c)}$ and $x_i\to x_i/r_c$ in the solution (2.6), and

the simple reason is explicitly making the induced metric on the cutoff surface to flat metric, i.e. the cutoff surface with metric $ds^2 = -dv^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2$. It should be pointed that the Hawking temperature is expressed as $T = T_+/\sqrt{r_c^2 f(r_c)}$ with respect to the killing observer $(\partial/\partial v)^a$ in the new coordinate system, and the Schwarzschild-AdS black brane solution becomes

$$ds^2 = -\frac{r^2 f(r)}{r_c^2 f(r_c)}dv^2 + \frac{2}{r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}}dvdr + \frac{r^2}{r_c^2}(dx^2+dy^2+dz^2). \tag{2.7}$$

Since we expect to obtain the transport coefficients of holographic fluid at finite cutoff surface like shear viscosity η, which usually needs the non-constant velocity of fluid. Therefore, we can first give the above static black brane a constant velocity through a boosted transformation in the cutoff surface, which obtains the five-dimensional boosted Schwarzschild-AdS black brane solution

$$ds^2 = -\frac{r^2 f(r)}{r_c^2 f(r_c)}(u_\mu dx^\mu)^2 - \frac{2}{r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}}u_\mu dx^\mu dr + \frac{r^2}{r_c^2}P_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu, \tag{2.8}$$

with

$$u^v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\beta_i^2}}, \quad u^i = \frac{\beta_i}{\sqrt{1-\beta_i^2}}, \quad P_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + u_\mu u_\nu \ . \tag{2.9}$$

where $x^\mu = (v, x_i)$ is the boundary coordinates at the cutoff surface, velocities β^i are constants, $P_{\mu\nu}$ is the projector onto spatial directions, and the boundary indices (μ, ν) are raised and lowered with the Minkowski metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$, while the bulk indices are distinguished by (A, B). Note that, after boosting the black brane solution in Eq. (2.7), the metric (2.8) describes a uniform boosted black brane moving at velocity β^i, and one obtains a solution with more parameters which can then be related to the degrees of freedom of the dual boundary fluid [11]. In addition, another underlying idea is that the boosted black brane solution will be related to a dual fluid solution of constant velocity.

In the gravity/fluid correspondence scenario, if one expects to obtain the transport coefficients like shear viscosity η of fluid, one needs perturb the bulk solution of gravity. And a simple way is promoting the constant parameters β^i and M in the boosted black brane solution (2.8) to functions of boundary coordinates x^μ at the finite cutoff surface [11, 12]. Since the parameters now depend on the boundary coordinates, the solution (2.8) is no longer a solution the field equation (2.2). Extra correction terms are needed to make (2.8) be a self-consistent solution. Before discussing these correction terms, we first define the following useful tensors

$$W_{AB} = R_{AB} + 4g_{AB}. \tag{2.10}$$

Note that, the right hand side of Eq.(2.10) is in fact equivalent to the left hand side of Eq. (2.2), i.e. instead of the Ricci scalar with Λ in Eq. (2.2). Therefore, the solutions of equation motions should satisfy $W_{AB} = 0$. It should be pointed out that there is a trick to obtain the extra correction terms. According to the Refs [11, 12], one can first obtain the extra correction terms at the origin $x^\mu = 0$. Then, the extra correction terms at any point x^μ can be simply obtained by making the extra correction terms at the origin $x^\mu = 0$ into a covariant form. Note that, in order to obtain the extra correction terms at the origin $x^\mu = 0$, we first expand the parameters around the origin $x^\mu = 0$, i.e. parameters $\beta_i(x^\mu)$ and $M(x^\mu)$. More details, in order to obtain the extra correction terms, one can first expand the parameters around $x^\mu = 0$ to the first order

$$\beta_i(x^\mu) = \partial_\mu\beta_i|_{x^\mu=0}x^\mu, \ M(x^\mu) = M(0) + \partial_\mu M|_{x^\mu=0}x^\mu. \tag{2.11}$$

where $\beta_i(0) = 0$ have been assumed at the origin $x^\mu = 0$, and we only consider the first order case in our manuscript. The simple reason that we can assume $\beta_i(0) = 0$ at the origin $x^\mu = 0$ is related to the fact that we can pass to a local inertial frame so that $\beta_i(0) = 0$ at the origin $x^\mu = 0$ [11]. Obviously, here x^μ are close to $x^\mu = 0$, and hence x^μ are small quantities which can be counted like ϵ. Therefore, the first order is meant as the first order of ϵ or x^μ. In addition, since the power of x^μ and the order of derivatives are always equally expressed in every term of the Taylor expansion in (2.11), thus the small x^μ expansion can also be equivalent to the relativistic hydrodynamic limit referred to in many works, i.e. $\partial_v \sim \epsilon$ and $\partial_i \sim \epsilon$. Thus after inserting the metric (2.8) with non-constant parameters and (2.11) into W_{AB} , the nonzero $-W_{AB}$ can be considered as the first order source terms $S^{(1)}_{AB}$. By choosing an appropriate gauge like the background field gauge in [11] (G represents the full metric)

$$G_{rr} = 0, \quad G_{r\mu} \propto u_\mu, \quad Tr((G^{(0)})^{-1}G^{(1)}) = 0 \ , \tag{2.12}$$

and taking into account the spatial $SO(3)$ symmetry preserved in the background metric (2.7), the first order extra correction terms around $x^\mu = 0$ needed to compensate for the source terms are [11]

$$ds^2_{(1)} = \frac{k(r)}{r^2}dv^2 + 2\frac{h(r)}{r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}}dvdr + 2\frac{j_i(r)}{r^2}dvdx^i + \frac{r^2}{r_c^2}\left(\alpha_{ij}(r) - \frac{2}{3}h(r)\delta_{ij}\right)dx^i dx^j, \tag{2.13}$$

Therefore, the first order perturbation solution around $x^\mu = 0$ can be obtained from the vanishing $W_{AB} =$ (effect from correction) $- S^{(1)}_{AB}$, which are complicated and have been listed in the appendix A. Here, the "effect from correction" means the correction to W_{AB} from (2.13). Note that, the cutoff effect has been incorporated in these equations through their dependence on r_c. In addition, from the first order perturbation equations, there are several interesting relations between these equations

$$\begin{aligned} &W_{vv} + \frac{r^2 f(r)}{\sqrt{f(r_c)}}W_{vr} = 0 \ : \ S^{(1)}_{vv} + \frac{r^2 f(r)}{\sqrt{f(r_c)}}S^{(1)}_{vr} = 0, \\ &W_{vi} + \frac{r^2 f(r)}{\sqrt{f(r_c)}}W_{ri} = 0 \ : \ S^{(1)}_{vi} + \frac{r^2 f(r)}{\sqrt{f(r_c)}}S^{(1)}_{ri} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

which can be considered as the constraint equations. In our paper, after using the first order source terms, we can further rewrite these constrain equations (2.14) as

$$\begin{aligned} &3\partial_v M + 4M\partial_i\beta_i = 0, \\ &\partial_i M + 4M\partial_v\beta_i = \frac{-4M\partial_i M}{r_c^4 f\left(r_c\right)} \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

which are usually related to the conservation equations of the zeroth order stress-energy tensor [11, 12, 18, 19].

It should be pointed out that the region interested in our paper is between the horizon and cutoff surface $r_+ \leq r \leq r_c$. After requiring a cancellation between the effects of correction and source terms, one can analytically obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h(r) &= C_{h2} + \frac{C_{h1}}{r^4}, \\ k(r) &= C_{k2} + C_{k1}r^2 - \frac{2C_{h2}r^4}{r_c^2 f\left(r_c\right)} + \frac{4C_{h1}M}{3r^4 r_c^2 f\left(r_c\right)} + \frac{2r^3\partial_i\beta_i}{3r_c\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}}, \\ j_i(r) &= \frac{r^3}{r_c^5 f(r_c)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\left(\partial_i M + r_c^4 f(r_c)\partial_v\beta_i\right) + \frac{C_{j1}r^4}{4} + C_{j2} \\ &= \frac{r^3 r_c^3\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}}{2M + r_c^4}\partial_v\beta_i + \frac{C_{j1}r^4}{4} + C_{j2}, \\ \alpha_{ij}(r) &= \alpha(r)\left\{\left(\partial_i\beta_j + \partial_j\beta_i\right) - \frac{2}{3}\delta_{ij}\partial_k\beta^k\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

where $\alpha(r)$ is

$$\alpha(r) = r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}\int_{r_c}^{r}\frac{s^3 - r_+^3}{-s^5 f(s)}ds \ , \tag{2.17}$$

and the Dirichlet boundary condition at $r = r_c$, regularity of the bulk fields at the horizon have been used to obtain $\alpha(r)$. In addition, $h(r)$ is solved from $W_{rr} = 0$, while $k(r)$ is solved from $W_{vv} = 0$ or $W_{vr} = 0$, and $j_i(r)$ is solved from $W_{vi} = 0$ or $W_{ir} = 0$. Therefore, the extra correction terms at the origin are obtained, and hence the extra correction terms at any point of the whole cutoff surface can be constructed from the extra correction terms at the origin $x^\mu = 0$ by making them into a covariant form [11, 12], which finally gives the first order perturbative solution for the bulk. Note that, the previous works usually investigate the holographic fluid just residing at the infinite cutoff surface (i.e., r_c to infinity) [11, 12]. Therefore, our study can be considered as a generalization of these works, where the holographic fluid at the infinite cutoff surface is generalized to the finite cutoff surface. However, it should be emphasized that this generalization is non-trivial, since the stress tensor of the holographic fluid at the finite cutoff surface is usually non-conformal and depends on the choice of boundary conditions [38, 42, 43]. All of those points can be seen more clearly in the following contents.

III. THE STRESS TENSOR OF HOLOGRAPHIC FLUID AT THE FINITE CUTOFF SURFACE AND ITS TRANSPORT COEFFICIENTS UNDER THE GENERAL BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

Given the first order perturbative solution for the bulk, we are able to extract information of the holographic fluid using the gravity/fluid correspondence. According to the correspondence, the stress tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ of holographic fluid residing at the cutoff surface with the induced metric $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ is given by [22, 44–48]

$$T_{\mu\nu} = 2\left(K_{\mu\nu} - K\gamma_{\mu\nu} - C\gamma_{\mu\nu}\right) \ , \tag{3.1}$$

where $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ is the boundary metric obtained from the well-known ADM decomposition

$$ds^2 = \gamma_{\mu\nu}(dx^\mu + V^\mu dr)(dx^\nu + V^\nu dr) + N^2 dr^2 \ , \tag{3.2}$$

the extrinsic curvature is $K_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2}(\nabla_\mu n_\nu + \nabla_\nu n_\mu)$, and n^μ is the unit normal vector of the constant hypersurface $r = r_c$ pointing toward the r increasing direction. Note that, the term $C\gamma_{\mu\nu}$ is usually related to the boundary counterterm added to cancel the divergence of the stress tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ when the boundary $r = r_c$ approaches to infinity, for example $C = 3$ in the asymptotical AdS_5 case. However, there is no divergence of the stress tensor in our case with finite boundary. In the following, we still add the boundary counterterm with $C = 3$ in the stress tensor, and the simple reason is that we require that our result should reduce to the previous result when r_c goes to infinity [11, 12, 42, 43].

Note that, C_{k1} should vanish for the solution of (A5) being consistent with (2.16), which can be checked by inserting $h(r)$, $k(r)$ and $\alpha_{ii}(r)$ into (A5). Therefore, excluding C_{k1} and C, the stress tensor of holographic fluid at the finite cutoff surface in fact depends on the following five parameters $C_{h1}, C_{h2}, C_{k2}, C_{j1}$ and C_{j2}, since the stress tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
T^{(0)}_{vv} &= 2\left(C - 3\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}\right), \\
T^{(0)}_{ii} &= \frac{-4M + 2\left(3 - C\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}\right) r_c^4}{\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} r_c^4}, \\
T^{(1)}_{vv} &= -2\partial_i\beta_i + 6\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} h\left(r_c\right) + \frac{\left(-2C + 9\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}\right) k\left(r_c\right)}{r_c^2} + 2\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} r_c h'\left(r_c\right), \\
T^{(1)}_{vi} &= \frac{\partial_i M}{f\left(r_c\right) r_c^4} - \partial_v\beta_i + 2\frac{\left(2 - C\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} + 3f\left(r_c\right)\right) j_i\left(r_c\right)}{\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} r_c^2} - \frac{\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} j_i'\left(r_c\right)}{r_c}, \\
T^{(1)}_{ij} &= 2\left(\delta_{ij}\partial_k\beta_k - \partial_{(i}\beta_{j)}\right) + 2\delta_{ij}\frac{\partial_v M}{f\left(r_c\right) r_c^4} + 2\left(-C + \frac{-2M + 3r_c^4}{\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} r_c^4}\right) a_{ij}\left(r_c\right) - \sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} r_c a'_{ij}\left(r_c\right) \\
&\quad + 2\delta_{ij}\left(\left(\frac{2C}{3} + \frac{5\left(2M - 3r_c^4\right)}{3\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} r_c^4}\right) h\left(r_c\right) - \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} r_c h'\left(r_c\right)\right) \\
&\quad + 2\delta_{ij}\left(\frac{\left(-2M + \left(3 - 2f\left(r_c\right)\right) r_c^4\right) k\left(r_c\right)}{2\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} r_c^6} - \frac{\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)} k'\left(r_c\right)}{2r_c}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3, 3.4}$$

It is obvious that one needs to fix these five parameters to extract the explicit transport coefficients of holographic fluid at the finite cutoff surface. Therefore, several conditions should be inserted and assumed. In fact, in order to keep a well-defined boosted transformation at the finite cutoff surface, the Dirichlet boundary condition can be chosen in (2.13) like [38, 42, 43]

$$h(r_c) = 0, \quad k(r_c) = 0, \quad j_i(r_c) = 0, \tag{3.5}$$

In addition, another condition can also be chosen

$$T^{(1)}_{vi} = 0, \tag{3.6}$$

since $T^{(1)}_{vi} = 0$ is a gauge choice which relates to the fact that one can always choose a suitable coordinate system to make the fluid with zero velocity. Therefore, one other condition is needed to fix the five parameters.

Note that, $T^{(1)}_{vv}$ is related to the perturbation of energy density, and the transport coefficients are contained in $T^{(1)}_{ij}$. From (3.4), we find that $T^{(1)}_{vv}$ under the Dirichlet boundary condition (3.5) can just depend on $h'(r_c)$, and hence $h(r)$. Therefore, in our previous work [43], we have admitted the energy density perturbed and chosen a special boundary condition $h(r)\equiv 0$. This special condition is equivalent to $h(r_c)=0$ and $h'(r_c)=0$ from (2.16). Under this condition, a term like bulk viscosity appears [43]. However, this term also can be identified as a perturbation of pressure. This degeneration is difficult to break in our previous work. In the following, besides admitting a perturbed energy density, we further carefully investigate a more general boundary condition, i.e., $h(r_c)=0$ and $h'(r_c)$ is kept as an arbitrary constant. From (2.16), we can find that keeping $h'(r_c)$ as an arbitrary constant is equivalent to keep the parameter C_{h1} as an arbitrary constant. Therefore, the other four parameters C_{h2}, C_{k2}, C_{j1} and C_{j2} can be solved from (3.5) and (3.6), which are all expressed in C_{h1}

$$\begin{aligned} C_{h2} &= -\frac{C_{h1}}{r_c^4}, \quad C_{k2} = -\frac{2\partial_i\beta_i r_c^2}{3\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}} - \frac{2C_{h1}(2M+3r_c^4)}{3r_c^6 f(r_c)}, \\ C_{j1} &= -\frac{4r_c^2\partial_v\beta_i}{\sqrt{f(r_c)}(2M+r_c^4)}, \quad C_{j2} = \frac{2Mr_c^2\partial_v\beta_i}{\sqrt{f(r_c)}(2M+r_c^4)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

After inserting (3.7) into (3.4), the non-zero components of stress tensor $T^{(1)}_{\mu\nu}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} T^{(1)}_{vv} &= -2\partial_i\beta_i + 2r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}h'(r_c) = -2\partial_i\beta_i - \frac{8\sqrt{f(r_c)}C_{h1}}{r_c^4}, \\ T^{(1)}_{ij} &= \frac{-2r_+^3\sigma_{ij}}{r_c^3} + \delta_{ij}\big(\frac{-2(2M+r_c^4)}{3(-2M+r_c^4)}\partial_k\beta_k - \frac{8(2M+r_c^4)C_{h1}}{3r_c^8\sqrt{f(r_c)}}\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Note that, usually the stress tensor of holographic fluid at the cutoff surface with the induced metric $\gamma_{\mu\nu}=\eta_{\mu\nu}$ can be written in a general form

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \rho\, u_\mu u_\nu + pP_{\mu\nu} - 2\eta\sigma_{\mu\nu} - \zeta\theta P_{\mu\nu}, \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$P_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + u_\mu u_\nu, \quad \sigma^{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}P^{\mu\alpha}P^{\nu\beta}\left(\nabla_\alpha u_\beta + \nabla_\beta u_\alpha\right) - \frac{1}{3}P^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\alpha u^\alpha, \quad \theta = \nabla_\mu u^\mu. \tag{3.10}$$

For the special case, i.e. $C_{h1}=0$ in (3.7) which is equivalent to $h(r)\equiv 0$ in our previous work [43], the explicit stress tensor of holographic fluid in this special case can be totally read out from (3.4) and (3.8)

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu\nu} &= \left(2\left(3-3\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}\right)-2\theta\right)u_\mu u_\nu + \frac{-4M+2\left(3-3\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}\right)r_c^4}{r_c^4\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}}P_{\mu\nu} - \frac{2r_+^3}{r_c^3}\sigma_{\mu\nu} \\ &- \frac{2(2M+r_c^4)}{3(-2M+r_c^4)}\theta P_{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Therefore, from (3.11) and (3.9), one obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= 2\left(3-3\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}\right)-2\theta, \quad \eta = \frac{r_+^3}{r_c^3}, \\ p &= \frac{-4M+2\left(3-3\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}\right)r_c^4}{r_c^4\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}}, \quad \zeta = \frac{2(2M+r_c^4)}{3(-2M+r_c^4)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

which reduces to the result in our previous work when the charge vanishes [43]. However, a small coordinates difference should be pointed out that the stress tensor in this special case just resides on $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ while the result in our previous work resides on $\gamma_{\mu\nu}=r_c^2\eta_{\mu\nu}$.

For the more general case, i.e. C_{h1} as an arbitrary constant, we can also simply read out from (3.8) and (3.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= 2\left(3-3\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}\right)-2\theta-\frac{8\sqrt{f(r_c)}C_{h1}}{r_c^4}, \quad \eta = \frac{r_+^3}{r_c^3}, \\ p &= \frac{-4M+2\left(3-3\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}\right)r_c^4}{r_c^4\sqrt{f\left(r_c\right)}} - \frac{8(2M+r_c^4)C_{h1}}{3r_c^8\sqrt{f(r_c)}}, \quad \zeta = \frac{2(2M+r_c^4)}{3(-2M+r_c^4)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where the stress tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$ of holographic fluid also resides on the spacetime $\eta_{\mu\nu}$. Besides the perturbation of energy density, we explicitly see that the perturbation of pressure appears in this general case, which is related to the non-zero C_{h1}. However, there are two subtleties in the above consideration (3.13). First, it is shown that the bulk viscosity can be zero if no perturbation of energy density is evoked, i.e. $T^{(1)}_{vv} = 0$, which has also been explicitly given in appendix B for the convenience of comparison. However, a subtle fact is that our result in (3.13) are not consistent with their results, since the bulk viscosity in (3.13) is neither zero nor dependent on the $T^{(1)}_{vv}$. On the other hand, for the $T^{(1)}_{vv} = 0$ case, one easily confirms that our results of the parameters (3.7) and stress tensor (3.8) are in fact same as those (B1) and (B2). For example, after solving the parameter C_{h1} as $C_{h1} = -\frac{\partial_i\beta_i r_c^4}{4\sqrt{f(r_c)}}$ from $T^{(1)}_{vv} = 0$ in(3.8), and then inserting the C_{h1} into (3.7), we find that (3.7) is just same as (B1). In fact, it is easily checked out that the perturbation of pressure term exactly cancels the bulk viscosity term in (3.8) or (3.13) in this case, which induces a zero bulk viscosity in (B3). Therefore, a confusion in literatures, including our work [43], the degeneration between the perturbation of pressure and the bulk viscosity in (3.8) if the C_{h1} relates to θ (i.e. $\partial_i\beta_i$), which implicates that there is another choice from (3.8)

$$\rho = 2\left(3 - 3\sqrt{f(r_c)}\right) - 2\theta - \frac{8\sqrt{f(r_c)}C_{h1}}{r_c^4}, \quad \eta = \frac{r_+^3}{r_c^3},$$
$$p = \frac{-4M + 2\left(3 - 3\sqrt{f(r_c)}\right)r_c^4}{r_c^4\sqrt{f(r_c)}} - \frac{8(2M + r_c^4)C_{h1}}{3r_c^8\sqrt{f(r_c)}} - \frac{2(2M + r_c^4)}{3(-2M + r_c^4)}\theta, \quad \zeta = 0. \tag{3.14}$$

Note that, in the above special case, i.e., the bulk viscosity term can also be treated as the perturbation of pressure with $\zeta = 0$. In order to break this degeneration, we further investigate these two choices (3.13) and (3.14). For the second choice, we find that there is an underlying simple relation between the perturbations of energy density and pressure, i.e. $\delta\rho$ and δp

$$\delta\rho = -2\theta - \frac{8\sqrt{f(r_c)}C_{h1}}{r_c^4}, \quad \delta p = -\frac{8(2M + r_c^4)C_{h1}}{3r_c^8\sqrt{f(r_c)}} - \frac{2(2M + r_c^4)}{3(-2M + r_c^4)}\theta, \tag{3.15}$$

that $\delta p = \frac{(2M+r_c^4)}{3(-2M+r_c^4)}\delta\rho$. Moreover, we can find that this relationship is consistent with the well-known result, i.e. the sound velocity of holographic fluid. The sound velocity of holographic fluid reads,

$$c_s^2 = (\frac{\partial p_0}{\partial \rho_0})_s = \frac{(2M + r_c^4)}{3(-2M + r_c^4)}. \tag{3.16}$$

where the energy density, pressure and entropy density are $\rho_0 = 2\left(3 - 3\sqrt{f(r_c)}\right)$, $p_0 = \frac{-4M+2\left(3-3\sqrt{f(r_c)}\right)r_c^4}{r_c^4\sqrt{f(r_c)}}$, and $s = \frac{r_+^3}{4r_c^3}$. Therefore, the second choice is obviously more reasonable, and thus we break the apparent degeneration of perturbation of the pressure and the bulk viscosity.

IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this paper, after constructing the first order perturbative solution of the Schwarzschild-AdS black brane spacetime, we mainly use the gravity/fluid correspondence to investigate the stress tensor of holographic fluid with transport coefficients at a finite cutoff surface in this first order solution. Note that, usually there are several parameters contained in the first order of stress tensor in the holographic fluid. In order to fix these parameters, we admit that the energy density of holographic fluid can be perturbed, i.e., $T^{(1)}_{vv}$ can be non-zero, and adopt a more general boundary conditions, i.e., C_{h1} is an arbitrary constant. Therefore, besides the shear viscosity, we also obtain the explicit forms of holographic fluid with perturbations of pressure and energy density in this general case. In the discussions of the metric perturbation, we turn on the derivative of $h(r)$ with respect to r at $r = r_c$. We find that this condition is crucial to yield the perturbation of pressure, and thus to discriminate between pressure perturbation and bulk viscosity.

Three discussions on our results are in order.

(1) The stress tensor in our paper just resides on $\eta_{\mu\nu}$, while the results in many works reside on $\gamma_{\mu\nu} = r_c^2\eta_{\mu\nu}$. For the convenience, we can simply compare the stress tensor in (3.11), i.e. under the special case $C_{h1} = 0$, with the results in our previous work with zero charge in Ref [43], where the stress tensor also resided on $\gamma_{\mu\nu} = r_c^2\eta_{\mu\nu}$. We obviously see that these two stress tensors can not be obtained from each other by just conformal transformation like

$\tau_{\mu\nu} = r_c^2 T_{\mu\nu}$ (here $\tau_{\mu\nu}$ is the stress tensor related to $\eta_{\mu\nu}$, while $T_{\mu\nu}$ is related to $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$), which is consistent with the point that the stress tensor at the finite cutoff surface is not a conformal fluid, i.e. conformal symmetry broken in the radial direction.

(2) There have been other methods and works to investigate the bulk viscosity [38–41, 49–53]. Since the apparent degeneration of bulk viscosity and perturbation of pressure is difficult to discriminate, we develop a new approach to break this degeneration in this paper. Our approach shows that a non-zero $h'(r_c)$ is critical to make the true bulk viscosity term become legible.

(3) Another interesting issue is related to the RG flow, i.e. the dependence of transport coefficients of dual fluid on the cutoff surface $r = r_c$. Several clues have shown that the transport coefficients obtained through gravity/fluid correspondence not only depend on r_c but also are affected by the boundary conditions. Therefore, which transport coefficients depending on $r = r_c$ can be interpreted as the RG flow should be further investigated.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities under grant No. NS2015073, National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under grant Nos. 11105004, 11175245, 11075206, 11275128, Shanghai Key Laboratory of Particle Physics and Cosmology under grant No. 11DZ2260700, and the Open Project Program of State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China (No. Y5KF161CJ1). In addition, it is also supported partially by grants from NSFC (No. 10821504, No. 10975168 and No. 11035008), the Ministry of Science and Technology of China under Grant No. 2010CB833004, and the Program for Professor of Special Appointment (Eastern Scholar) at Shanghai Institutions of Higher Learning.

Appendix A: The tensor components of W_{AB} and S_{AB}

The tensor components of $W_{AB} = (\text{effect from correction}) - S_{AB}$ are

$$W_{vv} = -\frac{8r^2 f(r)h(r)}{r_c^2 f(r_c)} - \frac{2\left(2M + r^4\right) f(r)h'(r)}{r r_c^2 f(r_c)} + \frac{f(r)k'(r)}{2r} - \frac{1}{2}f(r)k''(r) - S_{vv}^{(1)} ,$$

$$W_{vi} = \frac{3f(r)j_i'(r)}{2r} - \frac{1}{2}f(r)j_i''(r) - S_{vi}^{(1)}(r) , \tag{A1}$$

$$W_{vr} = \frac{8h(r)}{r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}} + \frac{2\left(2M + r^4\right)h'(r)}{r^3 r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}} - \frac{r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}k'(r)}{2r^3} + \frac{r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}k''(r)}{2r^2} - S_{vr}^{(1)}, \tag{A2}$$

$$W_{ri} = -\frac{3r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}j_i'(r)}{2r^3} + \frac{r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}j_i''(r)}{2r^2} - S_{ri}^{(1)}, \tag{A3}$$

$$W_{rr} = \frac{5h'(r)}{r} + h''(r) - S_{rr}^{(1)}, \tag{A4}$$

$$W_{ii} = \frac{8r^2}{r_c^2}h(r) + \frac{\left(-14M + 11r^4\right)h'(r)}{3r r_c^2} + \frac{1}{3r_c^2}r^4 f(r)h''(r) + \frac{f(r_c)k'(r)}{r} + \frac{\left(2M - 5r^4\right)\alpha_{ii}'(r)}{2r r_c^2} - \frac{1}{2r_c^2}r^4 f(r)\alpha_{ii}''(r) - S_{ii}^{(1)}, \tag{A5}$$

$$W_{ij} = \frac{\left(2M - 5r^4\right)\alpha_{ij}'(r)}{2r r_c^2} - \frac{1}{2r_c^2}r^4 f(r)\alpha_{ij}''(r) - S_{ij}^{(1)}, \ (i \neq j), \tag{A6}$$

$$W_{ij} - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij}\left(\sum_k W_{kk}\right) = \frac{\left(2M - 5r^4\right)\alpha_{ij}'(r)}{2r r_c^2} - \frac{1}{2r_c^2}r^4 f(r)\alpha_{ij}''(r) - S_{ij}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij}(\delta^{kl}S_{kl}^{(1)}), \tag{A7}$$

where the first order source terms are

$$S^{(1)}_{vv}(r) = -\frac{3\partial_v M}{r^3 r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}} - \frac{\left(2M+r^4\right)\partial_i\beta_i}{r^3 r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}}, \tag{A8}$$

$$S^{(1)}_{vi}(r) = \frac{\left(-2M+3r^4+2r_c^4\right)\partial_i M}{2r^3 r_c^5 f(r_c)^{3/2}} + \frac{\left(2M+3r^4\right)\partial_v\beta_i}{2r^3 r_c\sqrt{f(r_c)}}, \tag{A9}$$

$$S^{(1)}_{vr}(r) = \frac{\partial_i\beta_i}{r}, \tag{A10}$$

$$S^{(1)}_{ri}(r) = -\frac{3\partial_v\beta_i}{2r} - \frac{3\partial_i M}{2r r_c^4 f(r_c)}, \tag{A11}$$

$$S^{(1)}_{rr}(r) = 0, \tag{A12}$$

$$S^{(1)}_{ij}(r) = \left(-\delta_{ij}\partial_k\beta_k + 3\partial_{(i}\beta_{j)}\right)\frac{r\sqrt{f(r_c)}}{r_c}. \tag{A13}$$

Appendix B: The case $T^{(1)}_{vv} = 0$

In this case, the five parameters can be fixed from $T^{(1)}_{vv} = 0$, (3.5) and (3.6)

$$C_{h1} = -\frac{\partial_i\beta_i r_c^4}{4\sqrt{f(r_c)}}, \quad C_{h2} = \frac{\partial_i\beta_i}{4\sqrt{f(r_c)}}, \quad C_{k2} = -\frac{\partial_i\beta_i\left(-10M+r_c^4\right)}{6f(r_c)^{3/2}r_c^2},$$
$$C_{j1} = -\frac{4r_c^2\partial_v\beta_i}{\sqrt{f(r_c)}(2M+r_c^4)}, \quad C_{j2} = \frac{2Mr_c^2\partial_v\beta_i}{\sqrt{f(r_c)}(2M+r_c^4)}\ . \tag{B1}$$

Consequently, the non-zero components of $T^{(1)}_{\mu\nu}$ are

$$T^{(1)}_{ij} = -2r_+^3\sigma_{ij}/r_c^3\ , \quad \sigma_{ij} = \partial_{(i}\beta_{j)} - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij}\partial_k\beta^k. \tag{B2}$$

From (3.9), one can simply read out

$$\rho = 6\left(1-\sqrt{f(r_c)}\right), \quad p = \frac{-4M+6\left(1-\sqrt{f(r_c)}\right)r_c^4}{r_c^4\sqrt{f(r_c)}}, \quad \eta = r_+^3/r_c^3, \quad \zeta = 0. \tag{B3}$$

Obviously, the dual fluid obtained at the finite cutoff surface is indeed not conformal because the trace of $T_{\mu\nu}$ is nonzero, i.e. $\rho = 3p$ has been broken. This result is consistent with that in Ref. [26], and expected from the fact that the conformal symmetry has been broken with a finite radial coordinate in the bulk. In addition, as $r_c \to \infty$, the results in (B3) can relate to those in the infinite boundary by just a conformal factor. Since the conformal symmetry is recovered at this case, these results can be related to each other by conformal transformation. Moreover, since the entropy density from (2.7) is $s = \frac{r_+^3}{4Gr_c^3}$, and after recovering the coefficient $16\pi G$ in η, we can easily find that $\eta/s = 1/(4\pi)$, which is consistent with the well-known η/s result for the dual fluid at the infinite boundary in the Einstein gravity [11, 12, 18, 19, 42].

[1] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231 (1998) [Int. J. Theor. Phys. **38**, 1113 (1999)] [arXiv:hep-th/9711200].
[2] S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. B **428**, 105 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9802109].
[3] E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 253 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9802150].
[4] O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. M. Maldacena, H. Ooguri and Y. Oz, Phys. Rept. **323**, 183 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9905111].
[5] C. P. Herzog, J. Phys. A **42**, 343001 (2009) [arXiv:0904.1975 [hep-th]]; Y. Brihaye and B. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 126008 (2010) [arXiv:1003.5130 [hep-th]].
[6] J. Casalderrey-Solana, H. Liu, D. Mateos, K. Rajagopal and U. A. Wiedemann, arXiv:1101.0618 [hep-th].
[7] G. Policastro, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 081601 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0104066].

[8] P. Kovtun, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, JHEP **0310**, 064 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0309213].

[9] A. Buchel and J. T. Liu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 090602 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0311175].

[10] P. Kovtun, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 111601 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0405231].

[11] S. Bhattacharyya, V. E. Hubeny, S. Minwalla and M. Rangamani, JHEP **0802**, 045 (2008) [arXiv:0712.2456 [hep-th]]; M. Rangamani, Class. Quant. Grav. **26**, 224003 (2009) [arXiv:0905.4352 [hep-th]].

[12] J. Hur, K. K. Kim and S. J. Sin, JHEP **0903**, 036 (2009) [arXiv:0809.4541 [hep-th]].

[13] J. Erdmenger, M. Haack, M. Kaminski and A. Yarom, JHEP **0901**, 055 (2009) [arXiv:0809.2488 [hep-th]].

[14] N. Banerjee, J. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharyya, S. Dutta, R. Loganayagam and P. Surowka, JHEP **1101**, 094 (2011) [arXiv:0809.2596 [hep-th]].

[15] D. T. Son and P. Surowka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 191601 (2009) [arXiv:0906.5044 [hep-th]].

[16] H. S. Tan, JHEP **0904**, 131 (2009) [arXiv:0903.3424 [hep-th]].

[17] M. Torabian and H. U. Yee, JHEP **0908**, 020 (2009) [arXiv:0903.4894 [hep-th]].

[18] Y. P. Hu, H. F. Li and Z. Y. Nie, JHEP **1101**, 123 (2011) [arXiv:1012.0174 [hep-th]].

[19] Y. -P. Hu, P. Sun and J. -H. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 126003 (2011) [arXiv:1103.3773 [hep-th]]; Y. -P. Hu and C. -Y. Park, Phys. Lett. B **714**, 324 (2012) [arXiv:1112.4227 [hep-th]]; Y. P. Hu and J. H. Zhang, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2014**, 483814 (2014) [arXiv:1311.3974 [hep-th]].

[20] T. Kalaydzhyan and I. Kirsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 211601 (2011) [arXiv:1102.4334 [hep-th]].

[21] I. Amado, K. Landsteiner and F. Pena-Benitez, JHEP **1105**, 081 (2011) [arXiv:1102.4577 [hep-th]]; K. Landsteiner, E. Megias, L. Melgar and F. Pena-Benitez, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **343**, 012073 (2012) [arXiv:1111.2823 [hep-th]]; K. Landsteiner and L. Melgar, arXiv:1206.4440 [hep-th].

[22] I. Bredberg, C. Keeler, V. Lysov and A. Strominger, arXiv:1101.2451[hep-th].

[23] G. Compere, P. McFadden, K. Skenderis and M. Taylor, JHEP **1107**, 050 (2011) arXiv:1103.3022 [hep-th].

[24] R. -G. Cai, L. Li and Y. -L. Zhang, JHEP **1107**, 027 (2011) [arXiv:1104.3281 [hep-th]]; R. -G. Cai, L. Li, Z. -Y. Nie and Y. -L. Zhang, Nucl. Phys. B **864**, 260 (2012) [arXiv:1202.4091 [hep-th]].

[25] C. Niu, Y. Tian, X.-N. Wu and Y. Ling, Phys. Lett. B **711**, 411 (2012) [arXiv:1107.1430 [hep-th]]; T.-Z. Huang, Y. Ling, W.-J. Pan, Y. Tian and X.-N. Wu, JHEP **1110**, 079 (2011) [arXiv:1107.1464 [gr-qc]]; C.-Y. Zhang, Y. Ling, C. Niu, Y. Tian and X.-N. Wu, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 084043 (2012).

[26] S. Kuperstein and A. Mukhopadhyay, JHEP **1111**, 130 (2011) [arXiv:1105.4530 [hep-th]];

[27] G. Compere, P. McFadden, K. Skenderis and M. Taylor, JHEP **1203**, 076 (2012) [arXiv:1201.2678 [hep-th]]; C. Eling, A. Meyer and Y. Oz, JHEP **1205**, 116 (2012) [arXiv:1201.2705 [hep-th]].

[28] S. Kuperstein and A. Mukhopadhyay, JHEP **1311**, 086 (2013) [arXiv:1307.1367 [hep-th]].

[29] V. Balasubramanian, P. Kraus, A. E. Lawrence and S. P. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 104021 (1999) [hep-th/9808017].

[30] E. T. Akhmedov, Phys. Lett. B **442**, 152 (1998) [hep-th/9806217].

[31] J. de Boer, E. P. Verlinde and H. L. Verlinde, JHEP **0008**, 003 (2000) [hep-th/9912012].

[32] L. Susskind and E. Witten, hep-th/9805114.

[33] I. Heemskerk and J. Polchinski, JHEP **1106**, 031 (2011) [arXiv:1010.1264 [hep-th]].

[34] T. Faulkner, H. Liu and M. Rangamani, JHEP **1108**, 051 (2011) [arXiv:1010.4036 [hep-th]].

[35] N. Iqbal and H. Liu, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 025023 (2009) [arXiv:0809.3808 [hep-th]].

[36] I. Bredberg, C. Keeler, V. Lysov and A. Strominger, JHEP **1103**, 141 (2011) arXiv:1006.1902 [hep-th].

[37] S. -J. Sin and Y. Zhou, JHEP **1105**, 030 (2011) [arXiv:1102.4477 [hep-th]]; Y. Matsuo, S. -J. Sin and Y. Zhou, JHEP **1201**, 130 (2012) [arXiv:1109.2698 [hep-th]]; Y. Matsuo, S. -J. Sin and Y. Zhou, JHEP **1207**, 050 (2012) [arXiv:1204.6627 [hep-th]].

[38] D. Brattan, J. Camps, R. Loganayagam and M. Rangamani, JHEP **1112**, 090 (2011) [arXiv:1106.2577 [hep-th]].

[39] J. Camps, R. Emparan and N. Haddad, JHEP **1005**, 042 (2010) [arXiv:1003.3636 [hep-th]].

[40] R. Emparan and M. Martinez, JHEP **1207**, 120 (2012) [arXiv:1205.5646 [hep-th]];

[41] R. Emparan, V. EHubeny and M. Rangamani, JHEP **1306**, 035 (2013) [arXiv:1303.3563 [hep-th]].

[42] X. Bai, Y. -P. Hu, B. -H. Lee and Y. -L. Zhang, JHEP **1211**, 054 (2012) [arXiv:1207.5309 [hep-th]].

[43] Y. -P. Hu, Y. Tian and X. -N. Wu, Phys. Lett. B **732**, 298 (2014) [arXiv:1311.3891 [hep-th]].

[44] R. C. Myers, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 046002 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9903203].

[45] V. Balasubramanian and P. Kraus, Commun. Math. Phys. **208**, 413 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9902121].

[46] S. de Haro, S. N. Solodukhin and K. Skenderis, Commun. Math. Phys. **217**, 595 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0002230].

[47] R. Emparan, C. V. Johnson and R. C. Myers, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 104001 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9903238].

[48] R. B. Mann, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 104047 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9903229].

[49] A. Buchel, Phys. Lett. B **663**, 286 (2008) [arXiv:0708.3459 [hep-th]].

[50] S. S. Gubser, S. S. Pufu and F. D. Rocha, JHEP **0808**, 085 (2008) [arXiv:0806.0407 [hep-th]].

[51] A. Yarom, JHEP **1004**, 024 (2010) [arXiv:0912.2100 [hep-th]].

[52] C. Eling and Y. Oz, JHEP **1106**, 007 (2011) [arXiv:1103.1657 [hep-th]].
[53] A. Buchel, JHEP **1105**, 065 (2011) [arXiv:1103.3733 [hep-th]].